ORIGINAL



1

2

3

COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE - Chairman **BOB STUMP**

GEORGE BIEN-WILLNER, for

SANDRA D. KENNEDY

PAUL NEWMAN **BRENDA BURNS** 7011 JUL - 1 P 1:44

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION-GOMMISSION Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

JUL - 1 2011

DOCKETED BY

6

5

IN THE MATTER OF: 7

8

9

10

v.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

QWEST CORPORATION,

RESPONDENT.

GLENDALE & 27TH INVESTMENTS, LLC

COMPLAINANT,

DOCKET NO. T-01051B-10-0200

PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On May 17, 2010, George Bien-Willner, for Glendale & 27th Investments, LLC ("Complainant") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") a Formal Complaint ("Complaint") against Owest Corporation ("Owest"). The Complaint alleges that Owest has incorrectly billed Complainant, who owns and operates Sterling International Hotel, for a 1-800 line that should have terminated in 2004. Complainant requests relief in the amount of approximately \$10,000.

On June 10, 2010, Qwest filed an Answer to the Complaint, denying the allegations alleged in the Complaint. Qwest's Answer states that as a gesture of goodwill, and not as an admission of liability, Qwest provided Complainant a back credit to July 2009 and Qwest requests that the Commission dismiss the Complaint.

On August 16, 2010, by Procedural Order, Qwest's Motion to Dismiss was denied and a procedural conference was set for September 8, 2010.

On August 20, 2010, Complainant filed a letter requesting that the procedural conference scheduled for September 8, 2010, be rescheduled for early October, due to a conflict in Complainant's business schedule.

1

On August 26, 2010, Qwest filed a response to Complainant's request for a continuance of the procedural conference. Qwest stated that it had no objection to the continuance and requested to appear telephonically if the newly scheduled date conflicted with Qwest counsel's travel schedule.

On August 27, 2010, a Procedural Order was issued continuing the procedural conference to October 7, 2010, and Owest's request to appear telephonically was granted.

On October 7, 2010, the procedural conference was held as scheduled. Qwest appeared through counsel and Complainant appeared on his own behalf. During the procedural conference, the parties requested that Staff conduct an informal mediation to provide clarification on the issues involved in the Complaint and to see if settlement of the issues was possible.

By Procedural Order dated November 4, 2010, Staff was directed to engage in an informal mediation with the parties in an effort to clarify the issues involved in the Complaint and to determine if settlement of the issues is possible.

On December 7, 2010, Staff filed a Motion to Forego Staff Participation in Informal Mediation. Staff stated it has reviewed the issues in this matter during the informal complaint proceeding. Staff explained that during the informal process Staff acts as a mediator and the process allows complainants who are unfamiliar with Commission proceedings to attempt to resolve their issues in a more relaxed setting. Staff stated that both Complainant and Qwest are familiar with Commission proceedings and to conduct additional informal proceedings is unnecessary. Staff stated that re-examining the issues at the informal complaint level would be an inefficient use of Staff's limited resources and that this matter should continue as a Formal Complaint.

On December 10, 2010, the Complainant filed a Response to Staff's Motion ("Response"). Complainant stated that under A.A.C. R14-2-510, Complainant is entitled to participate in the informal complaint process.

On January 5, 2011, Staff filed its Reply in Support of Staff's Motion ("Reply"). In the Reply, Staff reasserted its position that the matter should proceed through the Formal Complaint process. Staff stated that Complainant will be afforded due process through the Formal Complaint proceeding.

On February 15, 2011, Complainant filed a letter requesting immediate assistance in addressing the issues raised in this docket. Complainant's letter further stated that Complainant

believes that this matter has been unjustly delayed to the benefit of Qwest.

On February 17, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued granting Staff's Motion. The Procedural Order also scheduled the hearing in this matter to commence on May 2, 2011, and deadlines were established for filing testimony and responsive testimony.

On March 3, 2011, Complainant filed Discovery Interrogatories and a Request for Production.

On March 17, 2011, Complainant filed a witness list. On the same day, Complainant docketed a response to Owest's letter of inquiry dated March 14, 2011.

On April 1, 2011, Qwest filed a Motion for an Order Revising the Procedural Schedule, and Compelling Complainant to Comply ("Motion"). Qwest's Motion states that Complainant has failed to file written testimony as directed by the Procedural Order issued on February 17, 2011, and that without written testimony Qwest is unable to prepare its responsive testimony. Qwest requests that the Complainant be directed to provide written testimony prepared by each of Complainant's witnesses; and that the procedural schedule be revised to allow Complainant to file written testimony and Qwest to file responsive testimony. Qwest further requests that Complainant be admonished for failing to comply with the Procedural Order and that Complainant be informed that future failure to comply could result in dismissal of the Complaint.

On April 13, 2011, by Procedural Order, Qwest's Motion was granted. The Complainant was again directed to file written testimony for its witness(s) with a new deadline of May 10, 2011. Complainant was put on notice that the failure to file written testimony and to abide by the procedural deadlines established in the Procedural Order could result in the dismissal of the Complaint.

On May 11, 2011, Complainant filed a witness list naming two witnesses and including one sentence describing each witness' testimony.

On May 23, 2011, Qwest filed a Motion to Dismiss ("MTD"). The MTD states that based on Complainant's failure to file written testimony and associated exhibits as twice directed by Procedural Order, the Complaint should be dismissed. The MTD further states that Complainant's vague descriptions do not articulate facts that would tend to support the Complaint, that they lack any specific allegation of wrongful acts committed by Qwest or any allegations of resulting harm for which the Commission might provide redress. The MTD states that Complainant's witnesses will

testify about billing issues and inaccurate account billings, but does not provide basic facts surrounding the Complaint, such as telephone services involved, the time periods, the account numbers, or the charges disputed. Qwest further states that Complainant's summary of testimony raises new issues not alleged in the Complaint. Based on the lack of information provided by Complainant, Qwest states it cannot reasonably prepare for hearing, or prepare written testimony in its defense. Therefore, Qwest requests that the Complaint be dismissed.

On June 1, 2011, Complainant filed a Response to Qwest's Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Compel Discovery Responses. Complainant's response states that Complainant filed a half-page Complaint; Complainant has requested (on March 3) discovery from Qwest and has not received the discovery; Complainant believes that Qwest's insistence on detailed, advance written testimony and exhibits will have little impact on the outcome of the case; and that Complainant has failed to provide exhibits and other information because Qwest has not responded to its discovery requests. Complainant request that the Commission order Qwest to respond to the discovery requests. Complainant's response states that imposing a requirement to file written testimony and exhibits is unwarranted and unjust, and in conflict with Commission rules. Complainant requests that Qwest's MTD be denied.

On June 7, 2011, Qwest filed a Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss and Response to Complainant's Motion to Compel Discovery. Qwest reiterated its assertion that the Complaint should be dismissed based on Complainant's repeated failure to file written testimony; that Complainant's generalized and unsupported allegations may lead to issues outside of the scope of the Complaint Bieng raised during the hearing; that Complainant never served its (March 3) discovery request on Qwest but instead filed it in the docket; and that Complainant did not raise the issue as to the March 3 discovery with Qwest until Complainant filed its response. Qwest requests that if the Complaint is not dismissed, that the Commission alternatively grant it time to respond or object to the March 3 discovery request.

Complainant has failed to comply with the orders set forth in the February 17, 2011, and the April 13, 2011, Procedural Orders which directed the filing of written testimony and associated exhibits in this proceeding. This proceeding cannot move forward until Complainant and any

witnesses the Complainant will have testify at hearing files detailed testimony and associated exhibits related to the specific testimony. Therefore, the hearing scheduled for July 11, 2011, should be converted to a Procedural Conference at which discussions will be held regarding the procedural posture of this proceeding and the resolution of the pending motions.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERDED that Mr. Bien-Willner and Owest shall appear for a Procedural Conference to discuss the procedural posture of this proceeding and the resolution of the pending motions on July 11, 2011, at 10:00 a.m., at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, Room 100, Phoenix, Arizona.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Bien-Willner's failure to attend the July 11, 2011, Procedural Conference may result in the granting of Owest's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113-Unauthorized Communications) applies to this proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal of representation must be made in compliance with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (Arizona Supreme Court Rule 42). Representation before the Commission includes the obligation to appear at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter, amend, or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

DATED this day of July, 2011.

25

26

27

28

1	Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered this 151 day of July, 2011, to:
2	George Bien-Willner GLENDALE & 27 TH INVESTMENTS, LLC 3641 North 39 th Avenue
4	3641 North 39 th Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85019-3601
5	Norman G. Curtright, Corporate Counsel
6	QWEST CORPORATION 20 East Thomas Road, 1 st Floor Phoenix, AZ 85012-3114
7	
8	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel Legal Division
9	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007
10	
11	Steven M. Olea, Director Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
12	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007
13	·
14	ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC. 2200 North Central Avenue, Suite 502 Phoenix, AZ 85004-1481
	,
15	06 0
15 16	By: Debra Broyles
	By: Debra Broyles Secretary to Yvette B. Kinsey
16	Debra Broyles
16 17	Debra Broyles
16 17 18	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20 21	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20 21	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Debra Broyles
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Debra Broyles